R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 016 865 VT 004 593

THE SPECIAL CONTRIBUTION OF THE COLLEGE HOME ECONOMICS EDUCATION SUPERVISOR TO THE STUDENT TEACHING SITUATION.

BY- DIRKS, MARIE AND OTHERS
PURDUE UNIV., LAFAYETTE, IND., MEAS. AND RES. CTR.

PUB DATE JUN 67

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.25 HC-$1.88 45P.

DESCRIPTORS- *TEACHER EDUCATION, *HOME ECONOMICS EDUCATION, *CRITICAL INCIDENTS METHOD, EVALUATION, *STUDENT TEACHING, *COLLEGE SUPERVISORS, TEACHING TECHNIQUES, TEACHER SUPERVISION, TEACHER ROLE, STUDENT TEACHERS, COOPERATING TEACHERS,

TEACHER EDUCATORS AT CORNELL UNIVERSITY, THE UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI, THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY, AND PURDUE UNIVERSITY IDENTIFIED THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF THE COLLEGE SUPERVISOR TO THE STUDENT TEACHING SITUATION BY MEANS OF THE CRITICAL INCIDENT TECHNIQUE. COLLEGE SUPERVISORS, SUPERVISING TEACHERS, AND STUDENT TEACHERS ACTIVELY ENGAGED IN THE STUDENT TEACHING PROGRAM DURING 1964-65 IN ALL FOUR INSTITUTIONS WERE ASKED TO REPORT BEHAVIORS WHICH MIGHT MAKE THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN SUCCESS OR FAILURE IN THE STUDENT TEACHING SITUATION. THE 454 USABLE REPORTS OF CRITICAL INCIDENTS WERE CATEGORIZED IN TERMS OF ROLES OF THE COLLEGE SUPERVISOR, THE DIRECTION OF CHANGE IN THE STUDENT TEACHING SITUATION, UNIQUENESS OR NONUNIQUENESS OF THE COLLEGE SUPERVISOR'S BEHAVIOR, AND THE IMPACT OF THE COLLEGE SUPERVISOR'S BEHAVIOR ON THE SUPERVISING TEACHER AND THE STUDENT TEACHER. THE COLLEGE SUPERVISORS ASSUMED THE INFORMATION OR JUDGMENT-GIVING ROLES MORE THAN ANY OTHER ALTHOUGH MULATING-GROWTH ROLE WAS REPORTED MANY TIMES. THEIR BEHAVIORS SEEMED EQUALLY IMPORTANT TO STUDENT TEACHERS AND SUPERVISING TEACHERS AND PRODUCED A DESIRED EFFECT MORE OFTEN THAN NOT. THEIR CONTRIBUTION WAS UNIQUE, AND THEY HAD MORE IMPACT ON THE STUDENT TEACHER THAN ON THE SUPERVISING TEACHER. NEED FOR SUPERVISORY ACTION OCCURRED MOST OFTEN IN THE AREAS OF STUDENT TEACHER SELF-CONCEPT, LESSON PLANNING, PROGRAM POLICIES AND REQUIREMENTS, AND RAPPORT WITH THE SUPERVISOR. FURTHER RESEARCH IS NEEDED TO DETERMINE WAYS TO MAXIMIZE COLLEGE SUPERVISOR CONTRIBUTION TO GROWTH OF PUBLIC SCHOOL SUPERVISING TEACHERS AND TO EXPLORE THE FEASIBILITY OF USING NONVISIT METHODS TO SUPERVISE STUDENT TEACHERS. A BIBLIOGRAPHY, GLOSSARY, AND CONTENT ANALYSIS OF SAMPLE CRITICAL INCIDENTS ARE INCLUDED. THIS ARTICLE IS PUBLISHED IN "STUDIES IN HIGHER EDUCATION," NUMBER 94, JUNE 1967. (FP)

ED016865

Studies in Higher Education

- **The Special Contribution of the College Home Economics Education Supervisor to the Student Teaching Situation**

  Marie Dirks, Cecile Elliott, Phyllis K. Lowe, and Helen Y. Nelson . . . . . .

[redacted] . . . . . .

June, 1967 **No. 94**

PURDUE UNIVERSITY
Measurement and Research Center

VTP045963

Studies in Higher Education publishes experimental studies, critical papers, and reviews concerned with educational theory and practice at the university level. Manuscripts in this area are invited.

Articles and monographs submitted for publication should be original typescripts, double spaced, on 8½" X 11" white paper. The typescript should represent the final form in which the author wishes the paper to appear.

Manuscripts should be addressed to:

The Editor

Studies in Higher Education
Measurement and Research Center
Purdue University
Lafayette, Indiana 47907

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

The Special Contribution of the College Home Economics Education Supervisor to the Student Teaching Situation

A Cooperative Study by:

Marie Dirks—Ohio State University

Cecile Elliott—University of Missouri

Phyllis K. Lowe—Purdue University

Helen Y. Nelson—Cornell University

Foreword

The study reported here grew out of a previous cooperative research study between these cooperating researchers and five other institutions. The Purdue researcher served as group chairman, but the researcher from each institution shared equally in the planning and executing of the study. Dr. Mary Lee Hurt, U. S. Office of Education, provided assistance by calling meetings of the group and serving as a consultant.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

The Special Contribution of the College Home Economics Education Supervisor to the Student Teaching Situation 6

The Problem and Its Background 6

Review of Related Literature 7

Method of the Study 8

Statistical Procedures 10

Analysis of Findings 12

Further Findings 27

Problem Areas 27

Supervisor Behavior 31

Multiple Reporting of Incidents 32

Secondary Impact 33

Summary and Implications 34

Bibliography 36

LIST OF TABLES

I. Hypotheses and Procedures for Categorizing Data ---------- 11

II. Frequency of Behavioral Roles of College Supervisors Classified by Institution ---------- 13

III. Importance of College Supervisor's Behavior as Viewed by Student Teachers and Supervising Teachers Classified by Institution ---------- 14

IV. Distribution of Effective and Ineffective Behaviors of College Supervisors in Four Institutions ---------- 15

V. Frequencies of Affirmative Opinion of College Supervisors and Supervising Teachers as to Need for College Supervisors ---------- 16

VI. Impact of Roles College Supervisor Assumed Upon Student Teacher, Supervising Teacher, and Combination of the Two Classified by Institution ---------- 17

VII. Roles College Supervisor Assumed Classified by Method Used in the Supervision ---------- 19

VIII. Groups Served Classified by Method Used in Supervision --- 21

IX. Frequencies of College Supervisors' Behaviors that Have Impact on Student Teacher and Supervising Teacher Classified by Institution ---------- 22

X. Impact of Effective and Ineffective Behaviors of College Supervisor upon Student Teacher, Supervising Teacher, and Combination of the Two ---------- 24

XI. Impact upon Groups Served by College Supervisor of the Effective Behaviors in Different Roles Assumed by College Supervisor ---------- 25

XII. Impact of Ineffective Behaviors in Different Roles Assumed by College Supervisor upon Groups Served ------- 28

XIII. Percentages of Incidents Classified According to Precipitating Problems ---------- 30

XIV. Behaviors of College Supervisors Classified According to Incidents Reported ---------- 32

XV. Numbers of Pairs and Triads of Reported Incidents ------- 33

XVI. Numbers of Reports Involving Secondary Impact of Supervisory Behaviors ---------- 34

LIST OF APPENDICES

1. Glossary ---------- 38

2. Content Analysis of Sample Critical Incidents ---------- 39

3. Information Sheet for Collection of Critical Incidents -------- 41

Never in our history has the demand for good teachers been as great as it is now. Student teaching as the capstone experience in the preparation of teachers has long been considered a major part of teacher education. As teacher educators do a better job of preparing those people who form part of the team working in student teaching, it should follow that the quality of teachers being prepared goes up proportionately.

Today more and more public schools are serving as laboratories for student teaching. The education of student teachers in these schools is the responsibility of both the college and the public school. Specifically, the college supervisor and the supervising teacher together provide direction and are professional counselors to whom the student teacher turns for guidance in developing techniques involved in the teaching-learning process. It is the role of the college supervisor to establish and maintain harmonious working relationships between the college and the public school and to serve as a liaison between these two institutions, interpreting the programs of each to the other. In addition to these responsibilities, the college supervisor often makes a real contribution to the in-service education of the supervising teacher.

The Problem and Its Background

With the desire for excellence in education and notably in this instance with the ever increasing demand for excellence in teacher preparation, greater numbers of student teachers, and concern for the best use of the college supervisor's time, it is not unreasonable that research should be focused on the special contributions of the college home economics supervisor to the student teaching situation. What are her unique functions? Is her major responsibility to help the student teacher or is her time better spent helping the cooperating teacher acquire more competency in supervision? What functions does she perform, both in terms of how she perceives what she does and how the student teacher and the cooperating teacher perceive what she does? What means does she use to perform these functions? Could some of the functions she performs be executed as well by someone else?

The problem posed for consideration in this study was essentially one of finding some answers to questions such as these. Specifically the purposes of the study were as follows:

1. To identify the special contributions of the college home economics supervisor to the student teaching situation.
2. To classify these contributions in terms of function, role performed, and effectiveness.
3. To determine if the contribution could have been made as effectively by others in the situation.

Review of Related Literature

It is difficult to maintain quality programs of student teaching in widely diversified public school situations unless the roles and responsibilities of the personnel involved are well defined and mutually accepted. Andrews (1) noted that while the literature defining the role of the cooperating teacher is fairly extensive there is little which spells out the role of the college supervisor. He presented a detailed analysis synthesized from all the lists available. In general, the roles of the college supervisor encompass: (1) liaison agent between college and schools, (2) placement and planning, (3) relations with cooperating teachers, (4) supervision of student teachers, (5) evaluation of student teachers, (6) service to schools, and (7) service at the college.

"The division of responsibility," Andrews (1) says, "is probably the most common area of misunderstanding and uncertainty between the cooperating teacher and the college supervisor." He presents a chart to "identify some of the common areas of uncertainty and to delineate the exact responsibilities for each position in these critical areas." The chart is designed to assist those working in teacher education to identify their roles more clearly and to direct their efforts more effectively, although institutional adaptations may be necessary at several points.

Lucio and McNeil (8) designate "the supervisor as a leader who has possession of two properties: one, a clear perspective of the school's goals and awareness of its resources and qualities, and, two, the ability to help others contribute to this vision and to perceive and to act in accordance with it."

One of the ways in which institutions vary is in their designation of the individual who shall fill the role of college supervisor. Some find it more advantageous to use a "general" supervisor who works with all the student teachers and supervising teachers in a given school or geographic area. Others advocate using the "specialist" supervisor who works only with the student teachers and supervising teachers in the area of specialization he represents. Conant (3) suggested that "the professor from the college who is to supervise and assess the practice teaching should have much practical experience. His status should be analogous to that of a clinical professor in certain medical schools." Furthermore, he contends "every institution . . . should have on the staff a clinical professor for each field or combination of closely related fields."

Edwards (6), looking at role expectation and role definition from the standpoint of the student teacher, says the college supervisor "is the person who knows most about the roles and expectations of the others, of the objectives for student teachers, and about the student

teacher himself! He is the key figure in establishing and maintaining a tension-free atmosphere for the student teacher in his new experience. It is the belief of the writer that many student teacher experiences have been less than satisfactory because the college supervisor has not taken the responsibility for instituting a definition and expectation of the roles and functions at the beginning of a student teaching assignment."

Lucio and McNeil (8) point out that roles are defined in terms of actions appropriate to various offices or positions and that "role is linked with the position, not with the person who is temporarily occupying the position." The more congruent the self-concept of the person occupying the position with the "actions and qualities which constitute the role," the more probable his success for the role both in terms of the expectations of others and in his own estimation. "When working with others, it sometimes seems to matter little what a supervisor actually does. It matters more that what others think the supervisor does is what they think he should do. Studies show, for instance, that members of a school system tend to evaluate a supervisor's behavior by comparing what they think he does with what they think he should do."

In short, in this most important element of the teacher education program, the student teaching experience, the college supervisor occupies a crucial role. How effective he is in the leadership role and as a member of the supervision team will depend upon the clarity with which the roles and responsibilities of those concerned are defined.

Method of the Study

The research report here was undertaken simultaneously at Cornell University, the University of Missouri, Ohio State University, and Purdue University. Previous research carried out cooperatively by researchers at some of these institutions and by the Universities of Nebraska, Tennessee, and Wisconsin, Oklahoma State University, and Pennsylvania State University had identified roles assumed by college supervisors as: (1) giving security, (2) giving judgment, (3) giving information, (4) stimulating growth, (5) strengthening relationships, and (6) identifying and/or solving problems. (Cooperative Report, 1959).

This study has aimed at identifying the contributions of the college supervisor to the student teaching situation by means of the critical incident technique devised by Flanagan (7). This technique has been used to assess the effectiveness and ineffectiveness of principals and teachers in studies by Samson (9), Cooper (4), Blank (2), and Stewart (11). Analysis of the performance of the college supervisor of home

economics student teachers had not been approached by means of the critical incident technique. The approach sought to determine the requirements of the position that make a difference between effectiveness and ineffectiveness in the performance of the supervisor. Qualified observers were asked for reports of behaviors which might make the difference between success or failure in the student teaching situation. It was expected that a number of behaviors that seemed to be "important" to that facet of a college supervisor's job which provides direction and guidance to the student teacher in developing competences involved in the teaching-learning process could be identified.

Persons reporting incidents of college supervisors' behavior should be those in a position to make a judgment about the supervisory service rendered (though admittedly the bases for such judgments might be quite varied). In the present study, supervising and student teachers and the college supervisors themselves were the qualified observer-reporters, thus providing first-hand knowledge of behaviors of the college supervisor in specific situations. What these respondents considered especially effective or ineffective supervisory behaviors furnished the data for testing the hypotheses under study.

The subjects identified for the study consisted of all of the college supervisors, supervising teachers and student teachers who were actively engaged in the student teaching program during the academic year 1964-65 in each of the four cooperating institutions.

In order to systematize reporting, the researchers prepared definition, descriptions, and examples of critical incidents, and forms on which to make the reports. (See appendix.) Since it is very important for each observer to have a clear notion as to what a critical incident is, and to be able to record it objectively on the information sheet, researchers at each institution met with groups of student teachers, to explain the forms and information sheets and to answer any questions they might have. Meetings were also held with the supervising teachers and college supervisors. It was pointed out to the participants that the critical incident description must (1) describe college supervisor behavior actually observed, (2) be accurate and detailed, (3) be objective and unbiased, and very importantly, (4) relate to a behavior believed by the reporter to be either clearly effective or clearly ineffective. It was emphasized that a critical incident should describe *what some college supervisor did in a specific situation at a specific time.* Approximately 480 reports of critical behaviors were collected.

Criteria for reviewing each report were set up to insure that each clearly described a specific incident of what a supervisor did in a student

teaching situation. Reports of incidents so vague as to be unclassifiable were discarded. The 454 usable reports of critical incidents were analyzed to identify the salient features of each and to categorize the data in accord with the hypotheses, *i.e.*, in terms of the roles of the college supervisor (identified in an earlier study), the direction of change in the student teaching situation, uniqueness or non-uniqueness of the college supervisor's behavior and impact that the college supervisor's behavior had on the student teacher and supervising teacher. Analyses of illustrative critical incidents are presented in the appendix.

The hypotheses tested in the study together with specific procedure appropriate to each for categorizing the data provided by the critical incidents are given in Table I. Each hypothesis represents five hypotheses: one each for four different institutions and one for data combining the four. Institutions labeled in tables as A, B, C, and D are identified as follows: A, Cornell University; B, Ohio State University; C, Purdue University; D, University of Missouri.

Statistical Procedures

While there were differences among the four institutions in length of teaching experience, semester versus quarter plan, and number of visits made by college supervisors, other factors were identified which argued for a sufficiently common population so that the data could be combined as well as analyzed by institution. The following factors suggested it was reasonable to make a combined analysis: 1) the college supervisors for all three institutions were home economics education staff members; 2) the institutions used similar criteria for selecting supervising teachers; 3) the general education, home economics, and professional education components of their teacher education curriculum were comparable; 4) all scheduled their student teaching experiences in the last two quarters or semesters before graduation; and, 5) the college supervisors in all institutions worked with both the student teachers and the supervising teachers.

To test the hypotheses under study the data were categorized appropriately and chi square formulae applied. With data combined from four institutions, most categories in all tables had large enough frequencies so that normal chi square methods could be utilized.

Where appropriate, the chi square formula (12) using a multiple contingency table was used: $x^2 = \Sigma \frac{(fo - fe)^2}{fe}$ where fo = observed frequencies and fe = expected frequencies. The 2 x 2 contingency

TABLE I

Hypotheses and Procedures for Categorizing Data

HYPOTHESIS	*PROCEDURE*
1. The behaviors of college supervisors identified by the critical incident technique will occur with equal frequencies in a pattern according to the roles assumed by the college supervisor.	Determine frequencies with which college supervisor's behaviors fall into role categories: security-giving; judgment-giving; information-giving; stimulating growth; strengthening relationships.
2. The same number of behaviors of college supervisors as identified by critical incidents seemed important to student teachers as to supervising teachers.	Categorize behaviors that seemed important to student teachers and supervising teachers.
3. There is an equal number of effective and ineffective behaviors of college supervisors as identified by the critical incident technique.	Categorize all behaviors into effect and ineffective classes.
4. The behaviors of college supervisors as identified by the critical incidents could be done as well by other persons in the student teaching situation as by the college supervisor.	Classify behaviors (those reported by college supervisors and supervising teachers only) as to whether situation was thought amenable to action only by college supervisor or by others.
5. There is no relationship between the roles into which the college supervisor's behaviors are classified and the groups on whom these behaviors have an impact.	Categorize behaviors having impact on student teachers and supervising teachers.
6. There is no relationship between roles into which the college supervisor behaviors are classified and the methods she uses to assume the role.	Determine frequencies with which college supervisor's methods fall into the 6 role categories.
7. There is no relationship between the groups she serves (student teachers and supervising teachers) and the methods the college supervisor uses to serve the groups.	Determine frequencies with which methods used fall into categories of groups served.
8. The same number of behaviors of college supervisors as identified by critical incidents have impact on student teachers as on supervising teachers.	Categorize behaviors that have impact on student teachers and supervising teachers.
9. There is an equal number of effective behaviors that have impact on: a. Student teachers b. Supervising teachers c. Both student and supervising teachers	Categorize effective and ineffective behaviors as to groups they have impact on.
10. The effective behaviors of the college supervisor, in each role she assumes, have equal impact on the student teachers and the supervising teachers.	Categorize effective behaviors in each role college supervisor assumes as to groups they have impact on.
11. The ineffective behaviors of the college supervisor, in each role she assumes, have equal impact on the student teachers and the supervising teachers.	Categorize ineffective behaviors in each role college supervisor assumes as to groups they have impact on.

tables were tested by chi square formula utilizing correction for continuity: $x^2 = \Sigma \frac{(fo - fe - .5)^2}{fe}$.

For single institutions data too small to handle by normal chi square methods were analyzed by utilizing the Fisher Exact Probability test* (10) and Table of Crucial Values of D (or C) of the Fisher test. Contingency coefficients were calculated from the significant chi square results using the formula $c = \sqrt{\frac{x^2}{N + x^2}}$

The reported critical incidents provided the data for testing each hypothesis.

Analysis of Findings

Some of the terms used in the study will convey their more common meaning while others are peculiar to the context in which they appear. In order to avoid misunderstanding, the terms are defined and presented in an appended glossary.

Hypothesis 1. The behaviors of college supervisors identified by the critical incident technique will occur with equal frequencies in a pattern according to the roles assumed by the college supervisor.

When the critical incidents were classified with regard to the roles of the college supervisor under which they fell, it was found that 60 incidents were considered to be security-giving; 139 incidents were categorized under judgment-giving, 122 under information-giving, 82 were classified as stimulating growth, and 48 as strengthening relationships. It is, of course, possible that a behavior could be attributed to more than one role (for example, perhaps a college supervisor gives *security* to the student teacher or the supervising teacher when she gives her *information* that reinforces a decision concerning a projected action). However, the categorizing was done with precise scrutiny of all words in the critical incident report, in particular verbs or verb phrases, and the researchers feel the categorizing is valid. Table II presents that data relevant to Hypothesis 1.

On the basis of data from the total sample comprising four institutions, hypothesis one was rejected at the .005 level of confidence: the behaviors did not occur with equal frequencies under the role categories. The contingency coefficient was .361.

The analysis revealed that for two institutions, Cornell and Ohio State, the chi square values were significant ($\rho > .005$) and the hy-

* A non-parametric technique for analyzing nominal or ordinal data when two independent samples are small in size and scores fall into one or more of two mutually exclusive classes.

TABLE II
Frequency of Behavioral Roles of College Supervisors Classified by Institution

		Gives Security	Gives Judgment	Gives Information	Stimulates Growth	Strengthens other Relations		x^2	p**	C**	Total
Institution	A	0	12	12	9	5	4*	25.56	.005 beyond	.615	42
	B	17	90	48	22	7	—	121.05	.005	.63	184
	C	37	29	48	32	28	—	7.68	.250	.40	174
	D	6	8	14	19	8	—	10.51	.05 beyond	.401	55
	ALL	60	139	122	82	48	4	68.2	.005	.362	451 & 4

* Institution A used a sixth category, "Other" for roles assumed by the college supervisor. Because the other institutions did not use this category, the four incidents reported in this category for Institution A were omitted from the computation of the "All" for this hypothesis.

** For Table II (and for Tables III through XII) "p" identifies probability; "C" identifies contingency coefficient.

pothesis was rejected. Contingency coefficients were .615 and .63 respectively. For one institution, Missouri, the hypothesis was still in doubt ($\rho > .05$). The contingency coefficient was .401. For the remaining institution, Purdue, the chi square value was not significant ($\rho > .25$) and the hypothesis was accepted.

Hypothesis 2. The same number of behaviors of college supervisors as identified by the critical incident technique seemed important to student teachers as to supervising teachers.

For one institution (Missouri) there was no difference between the number of critical incidents expected and those reported by student teachers and supervising teachers. For two institutions (Cornell and Ohio State) chi square values were not significant. The data for the fourth institution (Purdue) resulted in a chi square of 5.90 ($\rho > .025$). The contingency coefficient reached only .114. In this light of the results of the separate analyses, it would seem unreasonable to accept this hypothesis for the total group when it is so patently a reflection of a single institution. The data for single institutions and for the total group of institutions are shown in Table III.

TABLE III

Importance of College Supervisor's Behavior as Viewed By Student Teachers and Supervising Teachers Classified By Institution

	Behavior Identified by:		Strength of Relationship		
	Student Teachers	Supervising Teachers	x^2	p	C
Institution A	9	15	1.04	.50	.205
B	49	57	.46	.70	.063
C	30	52	5.38	.10	.247
D	14	14	—	—	—
All	102	138	5.10	.025	.144

Hypothesis 3. There is an equal number of effective and ineffective behaviors of college supervisors as identified by the critical incident technique.

Of the total incidents reported, 75 per cent noted the effectiveness of the college supervisor's behavior. This may be an underestimate of the percentage of effective behaviors since the instrument used for reporting incidents offered the alternative, "nothing has changed yet" which

several respondents chose in referring to positive or negative effect following intervention by the college supervisor.* The instrument would have provided more accurate data on this point had it been designed to identify completely what the reporter meant when she checked "nothing has changed yet," or if a later follow-up had been reported. Table IV presents data supporting the rejection of Hypothesis 3.

TABLE IV

Distribution of Effective and Ineffective Behaviors of College Supervisors in Four Institutions

	Type of Behavior		Strength of Relationship		
	Effective	Ineffective	x^2	p	C
Institution A	33	10	11.5	.005	.459
B	130	54	30.6	.001	.378
C	139	35	61.8	.001	.512
D	50	5	35.2	.001	.625
All	352	104	133.8	.001	.476

For the four institutions, 352 of the incidents reported related effective college supervisor behaviors; 104 were noted as ineffective. Chi square was 133.8, ($\rho > .001$); therefore the hypothesis was rejected. The coefficient of contingency was .476.

For each single institution analyses showed similar results: the chi squares were also significant ($\rho > .005$ or .001). The coefficients of contingency ranged from .378 to .625.

Hypothesis 4. The behaviors of college supervisors as identified by critical incidents could be done as well by other persons in the student teaching situation as by the college supervisor.

The test of this hypothesis involved classifying the critical incidents as to whether the respondents thought that the situation could be handled only by the college supervisor or if it could have been handled as well by someone else. Two-thirds of the situations were seen by supervising teachers and by the college supervisors as requiring intervention by the college supervisor. (No student teachers were asked for their reaction on this point.) See Table V for these data.

Over all, the findings indicated that supervising teachers and college supervisors felt the need to have the college supervisor as part of the student teaching experience. This is in line with other studies which

* See form for reporting incidents, appendix.

have presented evidence that teachers want help from college supervisors with stimulating thinking, providing information, security and judgment, and want mutual planning for and with student teachers.

TABLE V
Frequencies of Affirmative Opinion of College Supervisors and Supervising Teachers as to Need for College Supervisors

	Opinion of:		Strength of Relationship		
	College Supervisor	Supervising Teacher	χ^2	p	C
Institution A	23	11	35.59	.005	.715
B	78	49	.50	.50	
C	98	47	12.86	.01	.285
D	29	12	5.6	.02	.346
All	228	119	33.62	.001	.297

Chi square analysis yielded a value of 33.62 for the four institution total. This is significant ($\rho > .001$) and therefore, the hypothesis was rejected. The contingency coefficient was .297.

For Cornell the hypothesis was rejected because the chi square value was found to be statistically significant ($\rho > .005$); contingency coefficient was .715. At Purdue, data tested also yielded a significant value of chi square ($\rho > .01$); the contingency coefficient was .285. Data put to the test at Missouri showed the hypothesis in doubt ($.05 > \rho > .01$). The chi square value for data collected at Ohio State was not significant ($\rho > .50$).

Hypothesis 5. There is no relationship between the roles into which the college supervisor's behaviors are classified and the groups on whom these behaviors have impact.

In two institutions, Cornell and the University of Missouri, there were too few observations to compute chi squares. Here the use of the Fisher Exact Probability Test yielded non-significant results. In another institution, Ohio State, the chi square was non-significant. However, when observations for the total institutions were analyzed, a chi square was significant, ($\rho > .005$), and the hypothesis was rejected. The contingency coefficient was .232. There was a relationship between the roles into which the college supervisor's behaviors are classified and the groups on whom these behaviors have impact. In all roles assumed, the college supervisor had an effect on, or produced a result in, the student teacher more than on the supervising teacher. See Table VI.

TABLE VI

Impact of Roles College Supervisor Assumed Upon Student Teacher, Supervising Teacher, and Combination of the Two Classified by Institution

		Gives Security	Gives Judgment	Gives Information	Stimulates Growth	Strengthens Relations	Other	Total	X^2	p	C
Institution	*Impact on:*										
A	Student teacher	0	12	9	7	3	(4)	35			
	Supervising teacher	0	0	2	0	1	0	3			
	Combination	0	0	1	2	1	0	4			
	Total	0	12	12	9	5	4	42	*		
B	Student teacher	17	87	43	21	6	—	174			
	Supervising teacher	0	3	5	1	1	—	10			
	Combination	—	—	—	—	—	—	—			
	Total	17	90	48	22	7	—	184	6.90	n.s.	
C	Student teacher	23	29	39	29	24	—	144			
	Supervising teacher	13	0	9	2	3	—	27			
	Combination	1	0	0	1	1	—	3			
	Total	37	29	48	32	28	—	174	18.81	.005	.314
D	Student teacher	6	6	12	19	3	—	46			
	Supervising teacher	0	0	0	0	1	—	1			
	Combination	0	2	2	0	4	—	8			
	Total	6	8	14	19	8	—	55	*		
ALL	Student teachers	46	134	103	76	36	4	399			
	Supervising teacher	13	3	16	3	6	—	41			
	Combination	1	3	3	3	6	—	15			
	Total	60	139	122	82	48	—	455	25.77**	beyond .005	.232

* Chi squares could not be computed because of low expected frequencies.

** Category 6, "Other", used only by Cornell, was omitted from this computation, 4 incidents. Incidents (15) not assigned to the student teacher or supervising teacher, but to both equally, were omitted; expected frequencies for this third category, "Combination", were too low. Incidents which had equal impact on both student teacher and supervising teacher ("Combination") were divided between them.

Hypothesis 6. There is no relationship between roles into which the college supervisor behaviors are classified and the methods she uses to assume the roles.

Visits comprised 85 percent of the total number of methods used. During visits more judgment–and information–giving roles were assumed than were security-giving, stimulating growth or strengthening relationships. Where non-visit methods were reported, judgment-giving contributed very little to the total with security-giving making the highest contribution. Stimulating growth, information-giving and strengthening relationships were the roles represented in about two-thirds of the incidents reported in a non-visit setting.

Cornell and Missouri reported no methods used other than visit-conference. For each, no chi square is shown though both contributed data to the over-all analysis. Ohio State had no separate analysis and for Purdue a separate chi square was reported only for total non-visit methods.

Table VII shows the frequencies of the various methods used by the college supervisor to assume roles, the chi squares computed from the total of the methods used while visiting at the student teaching center, and the total of those methods used other than during the visit.

Hypothesis 7. There is no relationship between the groups she serves (student teacher and supervising teacher) and the methods the college supervisor uses to serve the groups.

The data for the total of four institutions disclosed evidence to reject hypothesis 7, ($\rho > .005$), that there was no relationship between the groups served and the methods used by the college supervisor. (See Table VIII.) The contingency coefficient was .239. For the total group the college supervisor employed non-visit methods (letters, phone calls, and on-campus conferences) to serve the supervising teachers with greater than expected frequencies and visit methods for this group with less than expected frequencies. The visit methods were used more frequently than expected to serve the combinations of student and supervising teacher. Cornell and Missouri reported use of only visit-conference methods.

The data were combined into "Visit" and "Non-Visit" categories because of low expected frequencies and a chi square of 51.8 (P .005) was found for the total group of four institutions. The contingency coefficient was .479. Hypothesis 6 of no difference between the role classifications of the college supervisor behaviors and the methods of assuming the roles was, therefore, rejected.

TABLE VII

Roles College Supervisor Assumed Classified by Method used in the Supervision

Institution and Method	Roles Assumed						Strength of Relationship		
	Gives Security	Gives Judgment	Gives Information	Stimulates Growth	Strengthens Relations	Total	X^2	p	C
A Visit—Conference	0	12	12	9	5	42*	—	—	—
B Visit	6	19	21	5	1	94			
Conference	5	73	22	17	6	227			
Letter	0	2	4	0	0	6			
Phone	1	0	1	0	0	2	—	—	—
C Visit:									
2-way Conference	1	2	5	1	4	13			
3-4-way Conference	9	23	33	14	10	89			
Coop. Notebook	0	1	0	0	0	1			
Informal	7	2	3	0	2	14			
Total	17	28	41	15	16	117	—	—	—

TABLE VII (cont.)

Institution and Method	Roles Assumed: Gives Security	Gives Judgment	Gives Information	Stimulates Growth	Strengthens Relations	Total	Strength of Relationship: X^2	p	C
C Non-Visit:									
Letter	10	0	1	12	1	24			
Phone	1	0	1	0	0	2			
Camp. Conference	7	0	4	5	11	27			
No Contact	2	1	1	0	0	4			
Total	20	1	7	17	12	57	33.45**	.005	.608
D Visits were only method reported (exception—one phone call). In order not to lose the value of the other 54 incidents, all 55 were considered visit.									
Visit	6	8	14	19	8	55	—	—	—
ALL VISIT	34	140	110	65	36				
NON-VISIT	21	3	12	17	12				
TOTAL	37	29	48	32	28	174	51.8**	.005	.480

* Includes 4 cases classified as "Other" and used only at Institution A. This category was omitted from the computations.
** The data were combined into "Visit" and "Non-Visit" because of the low expected frequencies.

TABLE VIII

Groups Served Classified by Method used in Supervision

Method and Institution	Group Served: Student Teacher	Supervising Teacher	Combination	Strength of Relationship x^2	p	C
A Visit-Conf.	35	3	4	16.06	.005	.526
B Visit	49	3	0			
Conference	118	5	0			
Non-Visit						
Letter	5	1	0			
Phone	2	1	0			
C Visit						
2-way Conf.	8	4	1			
3-4 way Conf.	68	6	15			
Coop. Notebk.	1	0	0			
Informal	13	0	1			
TOTAL VISIT	90	10	17			
NON-VISIT						
Letter	11	12	1			
Phone	0	2	0			
Conf.	26	0	1			
No Contact	4	0	0	11.53*	.005	.410
TOTAL NON-VISIT	41	14	2			
D**	46	1	18	88		
ALL TOTAL VISIT	338	22	39	beyond		
TOTAL NON-VISIT	48	16	2	28.23	.005	.239
	386	38	41			

* The data were combined into "Visit" and "Non-Visit" due to the low expected frequencies.

** All were visits with the exception of one phone call but reported as all visits in order to use these data. Institution D did not specify which incident was the phone call.

Hypothesis 8. The same number of behaviors of college supervisors as identified by critical incidents have impact on student teachers as on supervising teachers.

Behaviors of college supervisors were shown to have more effect on student than on supervising teachers. There was also significantly greater numbers of instances where the effect was greater with student teachers alone than incidents where an effect was produced both on student teacher and supervising teacher. Table IX presents these data.

TABLE IX

Frequencies of College Supervisors' Behaviors that have Impact on Student Teacher and Supervising Teacher Classified by Institution

	Impact on:			Strength of relationship		
Institution	Student Teacher	Supervising Teacher	Combination	x^2	p	C
A	35	3	4	48.78	.001	.750
B	174	10	0	311.28	.001	.792
C	144	27	3	196.25	.001	.728
D	36	1	18	33.33	.001	.614
ALL	389	41	25	557.91	.001	.742

Hypothesis 8 was rejected ($\rho > .001$) for the total institutions. The contingency coefficient was .742. The hypothesis was also rejected ($\rho > .001$) on individual analysis for three of them (Cornell, Ohio State, Purdue). For Missouri the hypothesis was rejected at the one per cent level of confidence. Contingency coefficients ranged from .614 to .793. There were unequal numbers of behaviors having impact on student teachers and supervising teachers.

Hypothesis 9. There is an equal number of effective and ineffective behaviors that have impact on: a. student teachers, b. supervising teachers, c. both student and supervising teachers.

For the four institutions it was shown that more effective than ineffective behaviors had impact on student teachers, on supervising teachers and on the combination of student and supervising teacher. For two institutions (Cornell and Missouri) analysis for supervising teacher and the combination of student and supervising teacher was not possible due to low expected frequencies and for one institution (Ohio

State), the combination frequency was too low. The remaining data reveal that for each institution more effective behaviors had impact on all concerned than ineffective behaviors.

For the four institutions, the above hypothesis was rejected, ($\rho > .005$). Contingency coefficients ranged from .483 to .584. There are unequal numbers of effective and ineffective behaviors that have impact on student teachers, supervising teachers or on both student and supervising teachers. This was true in every case with the exception of one (Purdue) where the chi square value was not significant ($.05 > \rho > .10$) on one test. Contingency coefficients ranged from .287 to .683. Data supporting the rejection of this hypothesis are found in Table X.

Hypothesis 10. The effective behaviors of the college supervisor in each role she assumes have equal impact on the student teachers and the supervising teachers.

For the total group of four institutions, separate chi square analyses were carried out to determine the impact of the effective supervisory behaviors on student teacher and supervising teacher in terms of each supervisory role assumed: security-giving, judgment-giving; information-giving; stimulating growth, strengthening relationships. A chi square of 11.08 for security-giving was significant at the .005 level; chi squares of 80.5, 53, 36 and 15.56 for the other four roles respectively were also significant ($\rho > .001$). Therefore, the hypothesis was rejected: for each of the roles assumed by the college supervisor there was a differential impact on student teacher and supervising teacher. Contingency coefficients ranged from .419 to .679 for the total group of institutions. See Table XI.

Looking at the individual institutions, Cornell had no incidents reporting security-giving behaviors. Those classified in this category for Missouri were not sufficiently large to be calculated. For Purdue a chi square of .29 was not significant. ($\rho > .750$). Ohio State alone had a significant chi square, ($\rho > .005$) to enable them to reject the hypothesis.

For judgment-giving, all institutions but one (Missouri had insufficient frequencies to calculate the chi square values) had chi squares similar to that reported for the four institution total. For the role of information-giving, all institutions had adequate numbers to calculate chi squares; these were all significant ($\rho > .01$ or better) with the exception of Purdue ($\rho > .10$).

TABLE X

Impact of Effective and Ineffective Behaviors of College Supervisor upon Student Teacher, Supervising Teacher, and Combination of the Two

INSTITUTION	IMPACT ON:	Type of Behavior		Total	Strength of Relationship		
		Effective	Ineffective		X^2	p	C
A	Student teacher	30	5	35	16.46	.005	.566
	Supervising teacher	3	0	3	—		
	Combination	4	0	4	—		
B	Student teacher	123	51	174	28.97	.005	.378
	Supervising teacher	7	3	10	.356	.0158	.104
	Combination	10	0	0	—		
C	Student teacher	107	24	131	51.33	.005	.531
	Supervising teacher	23	1	24	18.38	.005	.659
	Combination	14	5	19	3.37	.100	.371
D	Student teacher	45	1	46	40.20	.005	.683
	Supervising teacher	0	1	1	—		
	Combination	5	1	8	—		
TOTAL	STUDENT TEACHER	310	89	399	121.30	.005	.483
	SUPERVISING TEACHER	34	7	41	16.49	.005	.536
	COMBINATION	22	3	25	12.96	.005	.584

TABLE XI

Impact upon Groups Served by College Supervisor of the Effective Behaviors in Different Roles Assumed by College Supervisor

INSTITUTION	ROLE	Impact on: Student Teacher	Supervising Teacher	Combination*	Strength of Relationship X^2	p	C
	Gives Security						
A**		0	0	0	—		
B		15	0		10.90	.005	.649
C		17.5	13.5	(1)	.39	.750	
D		6	0	0	—		
ALL		38.5	13.5	(1)	11.08	.005	.419
	Gives Judgment						
A		10	0	0	8.10	.01	.669
B		53	2	0	45.46	.001	.673
C		21	0	0	19.00	.001	.689
D		6 & 1	0 & 1	(2)	—	—	
ALL		90 & 1	2 & 1	(2)	80.52	.001	.679
	Gives Information						
A		9 & .5	2 * .5	(1)	3.00	.10	.447
B		38	3	0	28.20	.001	.639
C		31	9	0	11.02	.001	.465
D		12 & .5	0 & .5	(1)	9.30	.01	.646
ALL		90 & 1	14 & 1	(2)	53.06	.001	.578

TABLE XI (cont.)

INSTITUTION	ROLE	Impact on: Student Teacher	Supervising Teacher	Combination*	Strength of Relationship: X^2	p	C
	Stimulates Growth						
A		6 & 1	0 & 1	(2)	—		
B		14	1	0	9.60	.01	.624
C		25 & .5	1 & .5	(1)	19.60	.001	.649
D		1	0	0	—		
ALL		46 & 1.5	2 & 1.5	(3)	36.26	.001	.645
	Strengthens Relations						
A		3 & .5	1 & .5	(1)	—	.001	
B		3	1	0	—		
C		18 & .5	1 & .5	(1)	12.80	.001	.624
D		3 & 1	0 & 1	(2)	—	.001	
ALL		27 & 2	3 & 2	(4)	15.56	.001	.56

* The incidents in this category "Equal Impact on Student and Supervising Teacher" were divided between student teacher and supervising teacher, .5 to each.

** Institution A reported no incidents of behaviors categorized as "security-giving."

Cornell and Missouri had frequencies too small to calculate a chi square for impact of stimulating growth and strengthening relationship roles. The other two institutions, Ohio State and Purdue, had chi squares significant at .01 and .001 respectively and the hypothesis was rejected for each of these two institutions singly.

Contingency coefficients calculated for significant chi square values for the separate institutions ranged from .465 to .689 as shown in Table XI.

Hypothesis 11. The ineffective behaviors of the college supervisor in each role she assumes, have equal impact on the student teachers and the supervising teachers.

No single institution nor the total of four institutions had sufficient observations to analyze ineffective behaviors with the security-giving role. Only one institution (Ohio State) had enough observations on ineffective behaviors in the judgment-giving role to analyze: this produced a chi square of 29.26, significant at the .001 level. No single institution had sufficient observations to analyze ineffective behaviors with the information-giving, stimulating growth, or strengthening relationship roles.

When frequencies were totaled for the four institutions, the only chi square value found to be significant was for the category "stimulating growth" ($\rho > .01$). The category of information-giving yielded a chi square value which left the hypothesis in doubt ($.01 > \rho > .02$). The chi square value of the "strengthening relationships" category was not significant ($\rho > .30$). Hence there appears to be insufficient evidence either to reject or accept hypothesis 11. These data appear in Table XII.

Further Findings

In addition to the analysis of data resulting in acceptance or rejection of the study's eleven hypotheses certain other analyses were undertaken: area of most frequent problems in the student teaching situation; type of interaction of college supervisors with student teachers and supervising teachers; multiple reporting of incidents; and possible impact of college supervisor behavior beyond the person for whom the action was intended.

Problem Areas. The reports of the critical incidents were examined for problems which had created a need for college supervisor intervention. The following problem areas were identified: lesson planning; self-concept, program policies and requirements, methods of teaching; rapport with supervisor, application of learning principles; personal characteristics, including communication skills; classroom management; pupil evaluation; home economics subject matter; discipline; personal management; adjustment to school.

TABLE XII

Impact or Ineffective Behaviors
In Different Roles Assumed by College Supervisor Upon Group Served

INSTITUTION	ROLES ASSUMED	Impact on: Student Teacher	Supervising Teacher	Combination*	Total	Strength of Relationship X^2	p	C
A	Gives Security	0	0	0	0	—	—	—
B		2	0	0	2	—	—	—
C		6	0	0	6	—	—	—
D		0	0	0	0			
ALL		8	0	0	0	—	—	—
A	Gives Judgment	2	0	0	2	—	—	—
B		34	1	0	35	29.26	.001	.675
C		8	0	0	8	—	—	—
D		0	0	0	0	—	—	—
ALL		44	1	0	45	39.20	.001	.682
A	Gives Information	0		0	0	—	—	—
B		5		7	—	—	—	—
C		8		0	8	—	—	—
D		0& .5	0& .5	(1)	1	—	—	—
ALL		13& .5	2& .5		16	6.25	.02	.53

TABLE XII (cont.)

INSTITUTION	ROLES ASSUMED	Impact on: Student Teacher	Supervising Teacher	Combination*	Total	Strength of Relationship X^2	p	C
A	Stimulates Growth	1	0	0	1	—	—	—
B		7	0	0	7	—	—	—
C		4	1	0	5	—	—	—
D		1	0	0	1	—	—	—
ALL		13	1	0	14	8.64	.01	.618
A	Strengthens Relationships	0	0	0	0	—	—	—
B		3	0	0	3	—	—	—
C		6	2	0	8	—	—	—
D		0 & 1	1 & 1	(2)	3	—	—	—
ALL		9 & 1	3 & 1	(2)	14	1.78	.30	.336

Category 6, "Other", used only by institution A was omitted. This included 2 ineffective incidents.

* The incidents in this category "Equal Impact on Both Student Teacher and Supervising Teacher" were divided equally between them, .5 to each. This was due to the low (expected) frequencies in this category.

Table XIII shows tabulation by institution of numbers and percentages of incidents arising from each of thirteen areas of concern or problem. Where data indicated a combination of problem areas but change was reported in only one area as a result of the behavior of the college supervisor, the incident was categorized in the area where a change was effected.

TABLE XIII

Percentages of Incidents Classified According to Precipitating Problems

Problems	Institutions				
	A N=43	B N=184	C N=172	D N=66	Total N=465
	%	%	%	%	%
1. lesson planning	9	20	13	27	18
2. self-concept	12	9	28	5	16
3. program policies and requirements	14	13	15	—	12
4. methods	23	10	8	18	12
5. rapport with supervisor	19	7	16	8	11
6. application of learning principles	—	10	2	24	8
7. personal characteristics incl. communications skill	5	8	5	—	6
8. classroom management	—	8	2	3	4
9. pupil evaluation	5	4	4	1	4
10. home economics subject matter	5	3	3	1	3
11. discipline	2	3	2	6	2
12. personal management	5	3	1	6	2
13. adjustment to school	1	2	1—	1	1
	100	100	100	100	100

Inspection of Table XIII reveals that the problems resulting in most instances of college supervisor intervention were in the areas of self-concept, lesson planning, methods of teaching, rapport with supervisor, and program policies and requirements. These five problem areas gave rise to approximately two-thirds of the critical incidents reported. In contrast to these areas where many incidents were reported, adjustment

to school, classroom management, discipline, pupil evaluation, knowledge of subject matter, and personal management were problem areas represented by less than five per cent each of the critical incidents tabulated. It may be possible that emphasis in pre-student teaching professional courses on lesson planning, teaching methods and program requirements may have created more sensitivity to problems in these areas and thus account for the larger quantity of incidents reported.

Supervisor Behavior. Behaviors of supervisors in their interaction with student and supervising teachers were classified into five categories: directive, less directive, permissive, evaluative and negative. In attempting to identify the behaviors, the researchers focused upon the verb or verb phrase used by the person writing the incident report. Where more than one verb or verb phrase was used to describe the behavior of the college supervisor, classification was determined according to that behavior given most emphasis. Where multiple descriptions were reported and it was perceived that there was little differentiation in emphasis, the researcher contacted the person reporting the incident for clarification and classification. When lapse of time and/or distance made this procedure impractical, the incident, as reported, was read to one and sometimes two research consultants who aided the researcher in making the classification.

This classification indicated forty-three verbs and verb phrases describing the behaviors of the college supervisor. Although these words or phrases were different a study of them revealed they could be categorized as follows:

Categories	Grouped Behaviors
Directive	—explained, pointed out specifics, illustrated, described, commented, shared findings, told, interpreted, and provided information
Less-directive	—encouraged, challenged, showed sincere interest, displayed willingness to help, eased concern, visited informally, guided, asked questions, cooperatively planned, helped adapt materials, and worked as a team member
Permissive	—discussed and suggested
Evaluative	—appraised, checked, analyzed, evaluated, confirmed, reinforced decision, and asked permission to reproduce plans
Negative	—gave no reassurance, arrived unexpectedly, caused tension by presence, frowned, stayed too long, overcriticized, took feelings out on student teacher, reprimanded, gave ultimatum, or no contact made

Table XIV shows numbers and percentages of college supervisor behaviors in these categories ordered from most to least used in the total group of institutions.

TABLE XIV

Behaviors of College Supervisors Classified According to Incidents Reported

Behaviors	Institutions				
	A N=43	B N=184	C N=172	D N=55	ALL N=454
	%	%	%	%	%
1. Less-Directive	23	28	26	33	27
2. Permissive	44	14	31	18	24
3. Directive	19	28	17	33	24
4. Evaluate	5	24	19	16	19
5. Negative		6	7	—	6
TOTAL	100	100	100	100	100

College supervisor behaviors appeared to be about equally divided among directive, less-directive and permissive categories, each of these being employed in about a fourth of the recorded incidents. Evaluative behavior was noted in about a fifth of all incidents. Negative behavior was relatively rarely used, being seen in only six percent of all incidents reported.

Multiple Reporting of Incidents. Of the 461 critical incidents received, only 75 were reported by more than one person involved in the situation. College supervisor and supervising teacher submitted reports of the same incident in 32 cases, as did college supervisor and student teacher in 25 cases. The combination of student teacher and supervising teacher reported the same incident in only 14 instances. Sets of reports submitted by three persons (supervising and student teacher, college supervisor) accounted for only 14 critical incidents. Table XV shows pairs and triads of reported incidents.

TABLE XV

Numbers of Pairs and Triads of Reported Incidents

Persons Reporting	Institutions				
	A	B	C	D	ALL
College Supervisor and Student Teacher	2	10	8	5	25
College Supervisor and Supervising Teacher	6	15	10	1	32
Student Teacher and Supervising Teacher	1	6	6	1	14
All Three Persons	0	9	2	3	14

It seemed surprising to the researchers to find so relatively few instances where two or more persons closely involved in a situation did not see (or perhaps saw but just did not report) the incident as critical. It was evident that not all individuals involved in a situation perceive the same criticalness or proponent of criticalness to report.

Secondary Impact. Impact has been defined for this study as "having an effect on, or producing a result in a participant in a critical incident." Analysis revealed that impact was principally on the student teacher in most of the critical incidents reported. In a few, the impact was mainly on the supervising teacher. The researchers believed it would be of interest to look at the incidents in the light of a possible secondary impact on the supervising teacher or (in a few cases) on the student teacher. In some instances the incident could only be interpreted as supervisory behavior having a dual effect, operating both on student teacher and supervising teacher. Table XVI presents tabulations of secondary impact.

TABLE XVI

Numbers of Reports Involving Secondary Impact of Supervisory Behaviors

Impact on:	Institutions				
	A	B	C	D	TOTAL
Supervising teacher	9	51	54	12	126
Student teacher	2	21	13	0	36
Both	4	0	33	0	26
TOTAL REPORTS	15	72	89	12	188

It is encouraging to note the number of incidents in which the college supervisor's behavior had an effect on or produced a result in the supervising teacher. Inferring primary impact on the supervising teacher in those 36 cases where a secondary impact was thought to be on the student teacher, the total number of incidents reached 188 where college supervisory actions were important not only to the student teacher but also to the supervising teacher.

Summary and Implications

This study has aimed at identifying the contributions the college supervisor in home economics makes to the student teaching situation. Data on effective and ineffective behaviors of college supervisors were collected by means of the critical incident technique. The data were categorized in accord with the hypotheses, i.e., in terms of the roles of the college supervisor, the direction of change in the student teaching situation, uniqueness or non-uniqueness of the college supervisor's behavior, impact that the college supervisor's behavior had on the student teacher and supervising teacher. To test the hypotheses the data were categorized appropriately and chi square formulas applied. Contingency coefficients were then calculated from the significant chi square results. The extent to which incidents were perceived by more than one person involved in a situation, the secondary impact of a college supervisor's behavior, the kinds of problems which created need for college supervisor intervention and types of behavior used by college supervisors in interactions with student and supervising teachers were examined and described.

A summary of findings for the study follow:

1. The behavior of college supervisors did not occur with equal frequency under the role categories of security-giving, information-giving, stimulating growth or strengthening relationships. There were more instances of the college supervisor assuming the information—or judgment-giving roles than any of the other roles; the stimulating growth role also appeared in many reported incidents.
2. Particular behaviors categorized as directive, less-directive, permissive, evaluative or negative tended to be used in assuming roles in the student teaching situation. Directive, less-directive and permissive were used about equally and more frequently than either evaluative or negative. Incidents involving negative supervisor behavior were relatively rare.
3. The college supervisors' behaviors seem important about equally to student teachers and supervising teachers.
4. College supervisors behaviors are much more often effective than ineffective; that is to say, what the college supervisor did much more often than not produced a desired effect.
5. College supervisors and supervising teachers feel the contribution of the college supervisor is unique; college supervisor action in many student teaching situations was believed to be necessary.
6. Different methods of supervising were used for the different roles assumed by the college supervisor in the student teaching situation. Visit methods accounted for most of the judgment- and information-giving role incidents; where non-visit methods were used, the security-giving role accounted for more incidents than others.
7. Non-visit methods served the supervising teacher with greater than expected frequency. The visit methods were used more frequently than expected to serve combinations of student and supervising teacher.
8. College supervisor behavior more frequently had an impact on the student teacher than on the supervising teacher in the student teaching situation. This was true in all roles she assumed.
9. College supervisor behavior while more frequently having an impact on the student than on the supervising teacher, often had a secondary effect on the supervising teacher.
10. More effective than ineffective behaviors had impact on student teachers, on supervising teachers and on the combination of student and supervising teacher.
11. Effective behaviors of the college supervisor in each role she assumed (security-information-judgment-giving, stimulating growth,

strengthening relationships) had more impact on student teachers than on supervising teachers.

12. Problems giving rise to college supervisory action were most apt to be in the areas of student teacher self-concept, lesson planning, program policies and requirements, and rapport with supervisor.
13. Though three or at least two persons were involved in a critical incident in the student teaching situation, all did not perceive the same criticalness to report.

There has been shown to be considerable agreement among college supervisors, supervising teachers and student teachers from the home economics education departments of institutions in four different states that the college supervisor performs a unique function and is perceived as a vital, necessary part of the student teaching situation.

Further research in supervision might well explore the ways in which the college supervisor's contribution to the continuous growth of the public school teacher as a member of a team preparing teachers can be maximized. Public schools are under much pressure to supply an annually increasing number of supervising teachers for guiding student teaching. Though quantitative demands increase, qualitative standards must not be lowered. There are even now not enough superior teachers who are prepared for the specialized responsibility of working with student teachers.

Another avenue for future research might be an exploration of the use of non-visit methods with student teachers. If, as was shown, non-visit methods served the supervising teacher effectively, they might serve student teachers effectively.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Andrews, Leonard O. *Student Teaching.* New York, Center for Applied Research in Education. 1964.
2. Blank, Lane Burton. "Critical Incidents in the Behavior of Secondary Physical Education Instructors." *The Research Quarterly,* 29, No. 1. (March 1958). 1-6.
3. Conant, James B. *The Education of American Teachers.* McGraw-Hill. 1963.
4. Cooper, Bernice. "*An Analysis of the Quality of the Behaviors of Principals as Observed and Reported in Six Critical Incident Studies.*" *Journal of Educational Research,* 56 (April 1963). 410-14.
5. Cooperative Research Group on Supervision in Home Economics Education. *The Study on Supervision: A Report of the Meeting.* Purdue University. December 1959.
6. Edwards, Phyllis O. *ABC's for Student Teachers.* Towson, Penna. 1953.
7. Flanagan, John C. "The Critical Incident Technique." *Psychological Bulletin,* 51, No. 4. (July 1954). 327-58.

8. Lucio, William H. and McNeil, John D. *Supervision: A Synthesis of Thought and Action.* McGraw-Hill. 1962.

9. Samson, Harland E. *Critical Requirements for Distributive Education Teachers-Coordinators: A Study of Observed Effective and Ineffective Behaviors of Iowa Secondary School Distributive Education Teacher-Coordinators Based Upon an Analysis of Critical Incidents.* Ph.D. Dissertation. University of Minnesota. 1964.

10. Seigel, Sidney. *Nonparametric Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences.* New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc. 1956.

11. Stewart, Lawrence H. "A Study of Critical Training Requirements for Teaching Success." *Journal of Educational Research.* 49 (May 1956) 651-61.

12. Wert, James E., Neidt, Charles O., Ahmann, J. Stanley. *Statistical Methods in Educational and Psychological Research.* New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc. 1954.

APPENDIX

GLOSSARY

Student teacher	A home economics education student who teaches under supervision in a college's affiliated teaching center or laboratory school as an integral part of her teacher preparation program.
Student teaching	The period during which a college student learns to perform the duties and responsibilities of the public school teacher under the guidance of the public school teacher and supervisors from the college.
Supervising teacher	The junior or senior high school teacher of home economics who supervises a home economics student teacher.
College supervisor	That member of a college faculty who assumes responsibility for coordinating and guiding the student teacher's activities.
Role	A function assumed by the college supervisor.
Behavior(s)	The supervisor's mode(s) of acting in the student teaching situation.
Effective	Producing a desired result.
Ineffective	Not producing a desired result.
Impact	Having an effect on, or producing a result in, a participant in a critical incident.
Importance	Significant, or consequential.

Content Analysis of Sample Critical Incidents

Person Reporting	Incident	Cause	Action of College Supervisor	Specific Results	Effective (+) or Ineffective (—)	Could only be handled by College Supervisor
Student Teacher	. . . conducting discussions by answering my own questions if students didn't immediately produce the response I was looking for	. . . felt pressed for time and thought I had to get info into students' heads somehow; . . . placing more importance on subject matter . . . how an actual thinking students should go through	CS suggested that I draw more answers from students . . .	ST began waiting for their answers and discovered that they could produce the desired ideas if ST worded questions so as to direct their thinking	+	Yes. If she had told me only the one time, I wouldn't have bothered to try it. Repeated suggestion finally made me try it
Student Teacher	Originally saw environmental situation as hopeless for teaching Foods unit	remodeling taking place and no water was available	three way discussion of ways in which unit could be taught without preparing food	ST used varied methods other than laboratory to teach food preparation	+	Yes
Supervising Teacher	Vocabulary level of ST too high and as a result some students were losing interest	lack of teaching experience at this level	recommended observation	ST observed other teachers working with this age level; at end of student teaching vocabulary was at appropriate level	+	No
Student Teacher	evaluation of first family relationships class: no summary and gave no reason for learning materials presented	lack of thinking through the lesson completely	made me aware of what I had left out	planned for summaries and gave more thought to lesson content	+	may have realized this alone later but glad it was pointed out at this early date to be corrected (Yes)

Content Analysis of Sample Critical Incidents (cont.)

Person Reporting	Incident	Cause	Action of College Supervisor	Specific Results	Effective (+) or Ineffective (—)	Could only be handled by College Supervisor
Student Teacher	Little response from class ordinarily responsive to supervising teacher. They didn't seem to learn anything	I can't write objectives or generalizations . . . lesson plans are poor because I leave out objectives and generalizations. I concentrate too much on subject matter and don't let pupils draw generalizations . . .	. . . told me that it's impossible to teach effectively unless I work more . . . on objectives and generalizations	. . . got completely discouraged and decided to quit. Did not improve in ability to work with generalizations	—	probably; supervising teacher uses objectives and generalizations but certainly wouldn't insist on them to extent CS has (Yes)
College Supervisor	Lack of enthusiasm, inspiration, satisfaction of ST for her work	lack of involvement with students in non-intellectual activities and routine type classes	praised competence of ST; suggested more challenging teaching situation i.e., heavier schedule and experience in leading discussions (teacher-pupil interaction)	ST's schedule revised by adding class working on unit lending itself to discussion	+	Yes
Supervising Teacher	ST was evaluating a lesson	lesson taught by ST was fairly good, but needed improvements were not recognized by ST	CS pointed out how learning experiences could have greater depth	ST more aware of need for acquiring depth in teaching	+	Yes

Information Sheet for Collection of Critical Incidents
The Special Contribution of the College
Supervisor to the Student Teaching Situation

Name _____

School _____

Description-definition of critical incident: A critical incident involves the description of a College Supervisor's behavior which has directly resulted in either a positive or negative change in the student teaching situation. Some aspects of the student teaching situation are:

1. performance in the classroom
2. preparation for teaching
3. relationships with faculty
4. relationships with parents
5. relationships with the Cooperating Teacher

1. People involved in the situation: (PLACE AN X BEFORE *YOUR NAME.*)
   College Supervisor _____ Student Teacher _____
   Cooperating Teacher _____ Others (Specify) _____

2. Date(s) of the situation _____

3. Description of the situation: _____

4. What caused the situation? _____

5. What did the College Supervisor do in this situation? _____

6. What specific changes in the student teaching situation took place as a result of the College Supervisor's action(s)? _____

_____

_____

7. As a result of the College Supervisor's action(s), I feel that the student teaching situation

_____ changed for the better

_____ changed for the worse

_____ did not change

8. Was the College Supervisor's action essential for change to have occurred in the situation? _____

_____

_____

_____

_____